

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/035,047	Applicant(s) WINN ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew O Savage	Art Unit 1724	

All Participants:

 (1) Matthew O Savage.

 (2) Mr. Jon E. Shackelford.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9 December 2004
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 6, and 8.

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to insert --an-- before "electrical conductor-- on line 9 of claim 1 to correct an obvious grammatical error. Changed the dependency of claim 3 from claim 2 to claim 1 prevent redundancy between claims 2 and 6. Agreed to amend claims 6 and 8 to specify the resilient member as being the spring clip for proper correspondence with the original specification. See the attached examiner's amendment and reasons for allowance for details..